arXiv:1205.1197v2 [math.DS] 25 Aug 2012

EMBEDDING THE DYNAMICS OF LORENZ MAPS IN LINEAR SYSTEMS

T. SAMUEL, N. SNIGIREVA, AND ANDREW VINCE

Abstract. In 1965 Parry proved that any topological mixing interval map with a finite number of discontinuities is topologically conjugate to a unique piecewise continuous map $U : [0,1] \circlearrowleft$ whose derivative is constant everywhere, apart from at a finite number of points. When restricting to Lorenz maps, Hubbard and Sparrow and independently Barnsley, Harding and Vince proved that the kneading sequence of the critical point fully determines U. In this article, we give necessary and sufficient conditions for the dynamics of a given Lorenz map to be fully embedded in the dynamics of a piecewise continuous interval map with a single discontinuity whose derivative is constant everywhere, apart from at the discontinuity. Further, as an application of this embedding result, we describe a new algorithm for calculating the topological entropy of a Lorenz map. Our algorithm, when practically implemented, yields excellent estimates for the topological entropy in cases where the entropy is known by theoretical means.

1. Introduction

In 1965 Parry [24] proved that any topological mixing interval map with a finite number of discontinuities is topologically conjugate (see Definition 2.4) to a piecewise continuous map $U : [0,1] \circlearrowleft$ whose derivative is constant everywhere apart from at a finite number of points. The proof in [24] uses measure-theoretic arguments. On the other hand, if one restricts to Lorenz maps (see Definition 1.1), then using purely geometric arguments this result has been recently re-proved by Barnsley, Harding and Vince [4]. Further, in 1990, Hubbard and Sparrow [19], showed that the kneading sequence of the critical point fully determines U. Moreover, Glendinning and Hall [15] showed that the topological entropy of such a map is related to the largest positive zero of a certain power series. This latter result, and more, also appears in [4].

A main motivation for the study of Lorenz maps is due to the fact that they arise naturally in the investigation of a geometric model of Lorenz differential equations which have strange attractors, see for instance [12, 20, 25, 26] and references therein. Another motivation comes from the theory of fractal transformations. The concept of a fractal transformation, that is a continuous (non-trivial) map from the attractor of one iterated function system to the attractor of another iterated function system, was first introduced by Barnsley, Harding and Igudesman [3]. A basic question is, when is such a fractal transformation a homeomorphism? The relation between this question and a special class of Lorenz systems is given in [3, 4, 5, 6]. A third motivation is that the simplest example of a Lorenz map is a β-transformation and such transformations play an important role in ergodic theory, see for instance [11, 14, 17, 24] and references therein.

Further results on the kneading sequences of Lorenz maps can be found, for instance, in the works of Hofbauer and Raith [17, 18], Alsedá and Maños [2], Misiurewicz [23], Glendinning, Hall and Sparrow [14, 15, 16] and Milnor and Thurston [22]. Results on kneading sequences of continuous transformations of the unit interval can be found, for instance, in [7, 8] and references therein.

Let us now present the formal definition of a Lorenz map and hence that of a Lorenz (dynamical) system.

Definition 1.1. *An upper (or lower) Lorenz map with critical point $q \in (0,1)$ is a piecewise continuous map T^+ (respectively T^-) : $[0,1] \circlearrowleft$ of the form*

$$T^+(x) := \begin{cases} f_0(x) & \text{if } 0 \leq x < q \\ f_1(x) & \text{if } q \leq x \leq 1, \end{cases} \qquad \left(\text{respectively} \quad T^-(x) := \begin{cases} f_0(x) & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq q \\ f_1(x) & \text{if } q < x \leq 1, \end{cases} \right)$$

where

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37B40 (primary), 37E05 (secondary), 28A80 (tertiary).

Key words and phrases. Entropy, Lorenz Maps, Kneading Sequences.

The first author was mainly supported by the grants EPSRC:EP/ PHDPLUS/AMC3/DTG2010 and ARC:DP0984353. The second author was partially supported by the grant ARC:DP0558974.

(i) *$f_0 : [0, q] \to [0, 1]$ and $f_1 : [q, 1] \to [0, 1]$ are continuous, strictly increasing, surjective functions, with $f_0(0) = 0$ and $f_1(1) = 1$ and either*

$$1 > \lim_{x \nearrow q} f_0(x) > \lim_{x \searrow q} f_1(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{or} \quad 1 \geq \lim_{x \nearrow q} f_0(x) > \lim_{x \searrow q} f_1(x) > 0,$$

(ii) *there exists a $s > 1$ such that $|f_i(x) - f_i(y)| \geq s|x - y|$, for $i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $x \in [0, 1]$.*

A Lorenz (dynamical) system with critical point q is defined to be a dynamical system $([0, 1], T)$, where T is either an upper or lower Lorenz map with critical point q. (Recall that a dynamical system is a pair (X, R) consisting of a topological space X and a map $R : X \circlearrowleft$.) An upper or lower Lorenz map with critical point p is called uniform if there exists an $a \in (1, 2)$ such that $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ and $f_0'(x) = a = f_1'(y)$, for all $x \in (0, p)$ and $y \in (p, 1)$. We denote such maps by the symbols $U^+_{a,p}$ or $U^-_{a,p}$ respectively. Specifically, the maps $U^+_{a,p}$ and $U^-_{a,p}$ are given by,

$$U^+_{a,p}(x) := \begin{cases} ax & \text{if } 0 \leq x < p \\ ax + 1 - a & \text{if } p \leq x \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad U^-_{a,p}(x) := \begin{cases} ax & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq p \\ ax + 1 - a & \text{if } p < x \leq 1. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

Remark 1.2. *It is important to note that for a uniform map $U^+_{a,p}$ or $U^-_{a,p}$ to be well defined we require that $a \in (1, 2)$ and that the critical point p belongs to the closed interval $[1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$.*

Notation. *Throughout this article we use the convention that ± means either + or −. Also, when we write, 'given a Lorenz map $T^{\pm}$ with critical point q', we require both the upper and lower Lorenz maps to be defined with respect to the same functions $f_0 : [0, q] \to [0, 1]$ and $f_1 : [q, 1] \to [0, 1]$. Further, following convention, we let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of non-zero positive integers and let $\mathbb{R}$ denote the set of real numbers.*

We now outline the two main results of this article.

(i) *Embedding dynamics*: The results of Theorems 1.6 and 1.8 give necessary and sufficient conditions for when the address space (Definition 1.5) of an arbitrary Lorenz system is a forward shift sub-invariant subset (Definition 3.7) of the address space of a uniform Lorenz system. These results complement and extend [19, Theorem 1 and Corollary 3], [15, Theorem 3] and [4, Theorem 6.5], see Page 4 for further details.

(ii) *An algorithm*: Based on these embedding theorems, we provide, in Section 6, an algorithm for calculating the topological entropy of a Lorenz system. This algorithm does not require previously used techniques of finding the maximal zero of a power series ([2, 4, 15] and references therein) nor does it require the calculation of the zero of a pressure functional ([13] and references therein).

Remark 1.3. *It is well-known that a Lorenz system is topologically conjugate (Definition 2.4) to the dynamical system consisting of its address space and the shift map (Definition 3.7). This together with the fact that Theorems 1.6 and 1.8 make inclusion statements about the address space of a Lorenz system and that of a uniform Lorenz system, justifies the expression embedding dynamics.*

In order to present our main results formally, namely Theorems 1.6 and 1.8, we require the following definitions.

Let $\Omega := \{0, 1\}^{\infty}$ denote the set of all infinite strings $\omega_0\, \omega_1\, \omega_2 \cdots$ consisting of elements of the set $\{0, 1\}$. It is well-known that the set Ω is a complete compact metric space with respect to the metric $d : \Omega \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$d(\omega, \sigma) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \omega = \sigma \\ 2^{-|\omega \wedge \sigma|} & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where $|\omega \wedge \sigma| := \min\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \omega_n \neq \sigma_n \}$, for all $\omega := \omega_0\, \omega_1\, \omega_2 \cdots, \sigma := \sigma_0\, \sigma_1\, \sigma_2 \cdots \in \Omega$ with $\omega \neq \sigma$. Further, throughout this article, we will assume that the set Ω is endowed with the lexicographic ordering which will be denoted by the symbols $\succ$ and $\prec$.

Definition 1.4. *The upper itinerary, also known as the upper kneading sequence, $\tau^+_q(x)$ of a point $x \in [0, 1]$ under an upper Lorenz map $T^+ : [0, 1] \circlearrowleft$ with critical point q is the string $\omega_0\, \omega_1\, \omega_2 \cdots \in \Omega$, where*

$$\omega_k := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (T^+)^k(x) < q \\ 1 & \text{if } (T^+)^k(x) \geq q. \end{cases}$$

(Here, and throughout this article, for n a non-negative integer, $(T^+)^n$ denotes the n-fold composition of T^+ with itself, where $(T^+)^0(x) := x$ for all $x \in [0,1]$.) Similarly, the lower itinerary, also known as the lower kneading sequence, $\tau_q^-(x)$ of a point $x \in [0,1]$ under a lower Lorenz map $T^- : [0,1] \circlearrowleft$ with critical point q is the string $\sigma_0\,\sigma_1\,\sigma_2\,\cdots \in \Omega$, where

$$\sigma_k := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (T^-)^k(x) \leq q \\ 1 & \text{if } (T^-)^k(x) > q. \end{cases}$$

Notation. *The itinerary map for the uniform Lorenz map $U^{\pm}_{a,p}$ will be denoted by $\mu^{\pm}_{a,p}$.*

Definition 1.5. *Given a Lorenz map $T^{\pm} : [0,1] \circlearrowleft$ with critical point q, we let $\Omega^{\pm}_q \subset \Omega$ denote the image of the unit interval $[0,1]$ under the mapping $\tau^{\pm}_q$. The set $\Omega^{\pm}_q$ is called the address space of the dynamical system $([0,1], T^{\pm})$. For a uniform Lorenz system $([0,1], U^{\pm}_{a,p})$, we denote the address space by $\Omega^{\pm}_{a,p}$.*

Further, given a Lorenz system $([0,1], T^{\pm})$, we let $h(T^{\pm})$ denote its topological entropy (Definition 2.1). For ease of notation, since $h(T^+) = h(T^-)$, we let $h(T)$ denote this common value, see Remark 2.2.

Finally we will require the definition of the coding map. For each $a \in (1,2)$ and $x \in [0,1]$ let $g_{0,a}(x) := x/a$ and $g_{1,a}(x) := x/a + (1 - a^{-1})$. The *coding map* $\pi_a : \Omega \to [0,1]$ is defined by

$$\pi_a(\omega_0\,\omega_1\,\omega_2\cdots) := \lim_{n\to\infty} g_{\omega_0,a} \circ g_{\omega_1,a} \circ \cdots \circ g_{\omega_n,a}(1) = \left(1 - a^{-1}\right) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \omega_k\, a^{-k}. \tag{3}$$

(For a proof that this map is well defined and a proof of the latter equality we refer the reader to [4, Lemma 4.6]). With these definitions we can, at last, state our main results (Theorems 1.6 and 1.8).

Theorem 1.6. *Let $([0,1], T^{\pm})$ denote a Lorenz system with critical point q such that $T^-(q) \neq 1$ and $T^+(q) \neq 0$ and for ease of notation let $\alpha := \tau^-_q(q)$ and $\beta := \tau^+_q(q)$. Then for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ the following statements are equivalent.*

(i) *The value a belongs to the open interval $(\exp(h(T)), 2)$.*

(ii) *The open interval $(\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1})$ is non-empty and*

$$\alpha \prec \mu^-_{a,p}(p) \prec \mu^+_{a,p}(p) \prec \beta,$$

for all $p \in (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1})$.

(iii) *The open interval $(\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1})$ is non-empty and*

$$\Omega^-_q \subset \Omega^-_{a,p} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega^+_q \subset \Omega^+_{a,p},$$

for all $p \in (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1})$.

Remark 1.7. *In Theorem 1.6 it is necessary to take the intersection of the open interval $(\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta))$ with the open interval $(1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1})$ instead of the open interval $(\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta))$ as the inequality $\pi_a(\alpha) < 1 - a^{-1}$ or $\pi_a(\beta) > a^{-1}$ may occur. Therefore the corresponding uniform Lorenz system will not be well defined, see Example 5.1 given on Page 11.*

Theorem 1.8. *Let $([0,1], T^{\pm})$ denote a Lorenz system with critical point q and for ease of notation let $\alpha := \tau^-_q(q)$ and $\beta := \tau^+_q(q)$.*

(i) *If $T^-(q) = 1$, then the following are equivalent*
   (a) *$a \in (\exp(h(T)), 2)$.*
   (b) *There exists a unique $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$, given by $p = a^{-1}$, such that*

$$\alpha = \mu^-_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) \prec \mu^+_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) \prec \beta. \tag{4}$$

   (c) *There exists a unique $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$, given by $p = a^{-1}$, such that $\Omega^-_q \subset \Omega^-_{a,p}$ and $\Omega^+_q \subset \Omega^+_{a,p}$.*

(ii) *If $T^+(q) = 0$, then the following are equivalent*
   (a) *$a \in (\exp(h(T)), 2)$.*
   (b) *There exists a unique $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$, given by $p = a^{-1}$, such that*

$$\alpha \prec \mu^-_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) \prec \mu^+_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) = \beta. \tag{5}$$

   (c) *There exists a unique $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$, given by $p = a^{-1}$, such that $\Omega^-_q \subset \Omega^-_{a,p}$ and $\Omega^+_q \subset \Omega^+_{a,p}$.*

To see why our results, Theorems 1.6 and 1.8, complement [19, Theorem 1 and Corollary 3], [15, Theorem 3] and [4, Theorem 6.5], we summary these results in the following theorem. Also, note that, Theorem 1.9 has been proved by Alsedá and Moñosas [2] in the setting of circle maps with one discontinuity.

Theorem 1.9. *Given an upper (or lower) Lorenz map with critical point q, their exist a unique $a \in (1,2)$ and a unique $p \in [1-a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ such that*

$$\tau_q^-(q) = \mu_{a,p}^-(p) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{a,p}^+(p) = \tau_q^+(q), \tag{6a}$$

and

$$\Omega_q^- = \Omega_{a,p}^- \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_q^+ = \Omega_{a,p}^+, \tag{6b}$$

where $a \in (1,2)$ is the maximal real solution of the equation $\pi_a(\tau_q^-(q)) = \pi_a(\tau_q^+(q))$ and where $p = \pi_a(\tau_q^-(q)) = \pi_a(\tau_q^+(q))$. Moreover, $\log(a) = h(T)$ and the unique topologically conjugate uniform upper (respectively lower) Lorenz map is the piecewise continuous map $U^+_{a,\pi_a(\tau^+(q))}$ (respectively $U^-_{a,\pi_a(\tau^-(q))}$).

One main aspect of Theorem 1.9 is that there exists a unique $a \in (1,2)$, namely $a = \exp(h(T))$, and a unique $p \in [1-a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ such that (6) holds. Theorems 1.6 and 1.8 complement and extend the results of Theorem 1.9, in that they, describe how (6) changes as we increase a and vary the critical point p. Specifically, for all $a > \exp(h(T))$, our theorems fully classify the points $p \in [1-a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ such that either

$$\tau_q^-(q) \preceq \mu_{a,p}^-(p) \prec \mu_{a,p}^+(p) \prec \tau_q^+(q) \quad \text{or} \quad \tau_q^-(q) \prec \mu_{a,p}^-(p) \prec \mu_{a,p}^+(p) \preceq \tau_q^+(q)$$

holds, which, as we will see, implies that we have an embedding of address spaces, or more formally, $\Omega_q^- \subset \Omega_{a,p}^-$ and $\Omega_q^+ \subset \Omega_{a,p}^+$.

In the final section of this article we present a new algorithm, based on Theorems 1.6 and 1.8, which calculates the topological entropy of a Lorenz map. The main idea behind the algorithm is the following. The algorithm first uses an efficient method to calculate the address spaces of a given Lorenz system $([0,1], T)$. Then, in a systematic way, it compares the address spaces of the given Lorenz system $([0,1], T)$ to the address spaces of a subclass of the family of uniform Lorenz systems. By a well-known result of Parry (see Theorem 2.3), the topological entropy of each member of this subclass of systems is known. Using Theorems 1.6 and 1.8 the algorithm is then able to obtain an estimate of the topological entropy of the given system.

Outline. The organisation of this article is as follows. In Section 2 we define the concepts of topological entropy and topological conjugacy. Properties of itinerary maps are presented in Section 3 and several auxiliary results which are required to prove Theorems 1.6 and 1.8 are proved in Section 4. These auxiliary results are also of interest in their own right. Section 5 contains the proofs of Theorems 1.6 and 1.8. We conclude with Section 6, where the statement and a proof of validity of a new algorithm for computing the topological entropy of a Lorenz (dynamical) system is given.

2. Entropy and topological conjugacy

The concept of topological entropy was introduced by Adler, Konheim and McAndrews [1] as a measure of the complexity of a dynamical system and is an invariant of topological conjugacy for dynamical systems (Definition 2.4). Bowen [9] gave a new, but equivalent, definition of entropy for a continuous map of a (not necessarily compact) metric space. For our purposes the following definition, based on that given by Bowen and consistent with the definition given in [1], serves as a definition of the topological entropy.

Definition 2.1. *The topological entropy $h(T^\pm)$ of a Lorenz system $([0,1], T^\pm)$ is*

$$h(T^\pm) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln\left(|\Omega_{q,n}^\pm|\right),$$

where q is the critical point of $T^\pm$, $\Omega_{q,n}^\pm := \{\omega|_n : \omega \in \Omega_q^\pm\}$ and $|\Omega_{q,n}^\pm|$ denotes the cardinality of the set $\Omega_{q,n}^\pm$.

Remark 2.2. *It is well-known and not difficult to show that $h(T^+) = h(T^-) \leq \ln(2)$. Therefore, for ease of notation, throughout we denote the common value $h(T^+) = h(T^-)$ by $h(T)$.*

Theorem 2.3. *If $a \in (1,2)$ and $p \in [1-a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$, then $h\left(U_{a,p}^+\right) = h\left(U_{a,p}^-\right) = \ln(a)$.*

Proof. See [24, Page 373]. This result can also be deduced from [18, Theorem 1]. □

Definition 2.4. *Two maps $R : X \circlearrowleft$ and $S : Y \circlearrowleft$ defined on compact metric spaces are called topologically conjugate if there exists a homeomorphism $\hbar : X \to Y$ such that $S \circ \hbar = \hbar \circ R$. Further, when we write, 'two dynamical systems are topologically conjugate', we mean that the associated maps are topologically conjugate.*

Lemma 2.5. *If two Lorenz systems $([0,1], T^{\pm})$ and $([0,1], R^{\pm})$ are topologically conjugate, then the address spaces are equal and hence, $h(T) = h(R)$.*

Proof. See [19, Theorem 1 and Corollary 3] or [4, Theorem 5.2]. A proof of the equality of the entropy can also be found in [2, Corollary 5]. ☐

3. PROPERTIES OF ITINERARY MAPS

In this section we will state properties of the itinerary maps (kneading sequences) $\mu_{a,p}^{\pm}$ of uniform Lorenz systems. Note, however, that these results hold in greater generality, namely for itinerary maps of an overlapping dynamical system, which is a special class of Lorenz systems, see [4, 5, 6].

At this point we remind the reader that in order for a uniform Lorenz system $([0,1], U_{a,p}^{\pm})$, and hence the itinerary map $x \mapsto \mu_{a,p}^{\pm}(x)$, to be well defined it is required that $a \in (1,2)$ and that the critical point p belongs to the closed interval $[1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$.

Definition 3.1. *For $\omega \in \Omega$, the string consisting of the first $n \in \mathbb{N}$ symbols of ω is denoted by $\omega|_n$ and $\omega|_0$ denotes the empty word.*

Definition 3.2. *For a uniform Lorenz system $([0,1], U_{a,p}^{\pm})$ and for a positive integer n define*

$$D_{a,p}(n) := \left\{ y \in [0,1] : (U_{a,p}^{+})^n \text{ has a discontinuity at } y \right\}.$$

Remark 3.3. *It is easy to show that $D_{a,p}(n) = \left\{ y \in [0,1] : (U_{a,p}^{-})^n \text{ has a discontinuity at } y \right\}$, that the cardinality of the set $D_{a,p}(n)$ is non-zero and finite and that $D_{a,p}(n) \subset D_{a,p}(n+1)$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Further, the cardinality of the set $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} D_{a,p}(n)$ is countably infinite.*

Lemma 3.4. *Let $a \in (1,2)$ and let $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ be fixed. Then the following hold.*

(i) *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $x \in [0,1] \setminus D_{a,p}(n)$ we have that*

$$\mu_{a,p}^{+}(x)|_n = \mu_{a,p}^{-}(x)|_n.$$

(ii) *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a $\delta_n := \delta_n(x) > 0$ such that,*

$$\mu_{a,p}^{\pm}(x)|_n = \mu_{a,q}^{\pm}(x)|_n. \tag{7}$$

for all $q \in (p - \delta_n, p + \delta_n) \cap [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$.

(iii) *If $x \in [0,1] \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} D_{a,p}(n)$, then $\mu_{a,p}^{+}(x) = \mu_{a,p}^{-}(x)$.*

Proof. See [5, Section 2]. ☐

Lemma 3.5. *For each $a \in (1,2)$ and every $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$, the following hold with respect to the metric d given in (2).*

(i) *The map $[0,1] \ni x \mapsto \mu_{a,p}^{+}(x)$ is strictly increasing and right-continuous. Moreover, for all $x \in (0,1)$, we have that*

$$\mu_{a,p}^{-}(x) = \lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \mu_{a,p}^{+}(x - \epsilon). \tag{8}$$

(ii) *The map $[0,1] \ni x \mapsto \mu_{a,p}^{-}(x)$ is strictly increasing and left-continuous. Moreover, for all $x \in (0,1)$, we have that*

$$\mu_{a,p}^{+}(x) = \lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \mu_{a,p}^{-}(x + \epsilon). \tag{9}$$

Proof. See [4, Lemma 5.3] or [5, Section 2]. A proof of the monotonicity properties and the equalities given in (8) and (9) are also provided in [15, Section 2.2]. ☐

Lemma 3.6. *Let $a \in (1,2)$ be fixed. Then the following results hold with respect to the metric d given in (2).*

(i) *The map $p \mapsto \mu_{a,p}^{+}(p)$ is strictly increasing and right-continuous.*

(ii) *The map $p \mapsto \mu_{a,p}^{-}(p)$ is strictly increasing and left-continuous.*

Proof. See for instance [5, Lemma 2 and Corollary 3]. ☐

We conclude with the a result which links the code map π_a, defined in (3), and the itinerary map $\mu^{\pm}_{a,p}$.

Definition 3.7. *Recall that* Ω *denotes the set of all infinite strings consisting of elements of the set* $\{0, 1\}$*. The continuous map* $S : \Omega \circlearrowleft$ *defined by* $S(\omega_0\,\omega_1\,\omega_2\cdots) := \omega_1\,\omega_2\,\omega_3\cdots$*, is called the shift map. Further, a subset* Λ *of* Ω *is called forward shift sub-invariant if* $S(\Lambda) \subseteq \Lambda$*.*

Proposition 3.8. *Let* $a \in (1, 2)$ *and* $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ *be fixed. Then* $\pi_a\left(\mu^{\pm}_{a,p}(x)\right) = x$*, for all* $x \in [0, 1]$*, and the following diagram commutes*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega^{\pm}_{a,p} \arrow[r, "S"] \arrow[d, "\pi_a"'] & \Omega^{\pm}_{a,p} \arrow[d, "\pi_a"] \\
{[0,1]} \arrow[r, "U^{\pm}_{a,p}"'] & {[0,1]}.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. The result is readily verifiable from the definitions of the maps involved. Also a sketch of the proof of the result appears in [4, Section 5] and [15, Section 2.2]. ☐

4. Auxiliary results

Here we present and prove several necessary auxiliary results which will be required in Sections 5 and 6, where we respectively provide the proofs of our main results (Theorems 1.6 and 1.8) and our algorithm. These auxiliary results are also interesting in their own right.

Definition 4.1. *For a Lorenz map* $T^{\pm} : [0, 1] \circlearrowleft$ *with critical point* q*, the itineraries of* q*, namely* $\alpha := \tau^{-}_{q}(q)$ *and* $\beta := \tau^{+}_{q}(q)$*, are called the critical itineraries.*

From here on, unless otherwise stated, let $([0, 1], T^{\pm})$ denote a Lorenz system with critical point q, let $\tau^{\pm}_{q}$ denote the associated itinerary map, let $\Omega^{\pm}_{q}$ denote the associated address space and let α and β denote the associated critical itineraries.

Lemma 4.2. *The address space* $\Omega^{\pm}_{q}$ *is forward shift sub-invariant, that is* $S(\Omega^{\pm}_{q}) \subseteq \Omega^{\pm}_{q}$*.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.8. ☐

A partial version of the following result can be found in [17, Lemma 1]. To the best of our knowledge, this result first appeared in [19, Theorem 1], and later in [2, 4, 5].

Theorem 4.3. *The address spaces* Ω^{+}_{q} *and* Ω^{-}_{q} *are uniquely determined by the critical itineraries* α *and* β *as follows:*

$$\Omega^{+}_{q} = \{\omega \in \Omega : \overline{0} \preceq S^n(\omega) \prec \alpha \text{ or } \beta \preceq S^n(\omega) \preceq \overline{1}, \text{ for all integers } n \geq 0\}$$

and

$$\Omega^{-}_{q} = \{\omega \in \Omega : \overline{0} \preceq S^n(\omega) \preceq \alpha \text{ or } \beta \prec S^n(\omega) \preceq \overline{1}, \text{ for all integers } n \geq 0\},$$

where $\overline{0}$ *denotes the element* $0\,0\,0\cdots \in \Omega$ *and* $\overline{1}$ *to denotes the element* $1\,1\,1\cdots \in \Omega$*.*

Corollary 4.4. *Let* $a \in (1, 2)$ *be fixed.*

(i) *If there exists a* $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ *such that* $\alpha \preceq \mu^{-}_{a,p}(p) \prec \mu^{+}_{a,p}(p) \preceq \beta$*, then* $h(T) \leq \ln(a)$*.*
(ii) *If there exists a* $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ *such that* $\mu^{-}_{a,p}(p) \preceq \alpha \prec \beta \preceq \mu^{+}_{a,p}(p)$*, then* $h(T) \geq \ln(a)$*.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Definition 2.1 and Theorems 2.3 and 4.3. ☐

Lemma 4.5. *Given an* $a \in (1, 2)$*, there exists a* $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ *such that either*

$$\alpha \preceq \mu^{-}_{a,p}(p) \prec \mu^{+}_{a,p}(p) \preceq \beta \tag{11a}$$

or

$$\mu^{-}_{a,p}(p) \preceq \alpha \prec \beta \preceq \mu^{+}_{a,p}(p). \tag{11b}$$

Hence, by Corollary 4.4, in the first case $h(T) \leq \ln(a)$*, and in the second case* $h(T) \geq \ln(a)$*.*

Proof. Since a lower itinerary always starts with 0 and an upper itinerary always starts with 1, we have that

$$\alpha \preceq 0\overline{1} = \mu^-_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^+_{a,1-a^{-1}}(1-a^{-1}) = 1\overline{0} \preceq \beta.$$

Hence, the inequalities given in (11a) hold for $p = 1 - a^{-1}$, unless

$$\mu^-_{a,1-a^{-1}}(1-a^{-1}) \prec \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^+_{a,1-a^{-1}}(1-a^{-1}) \preceq \beta, \tag{12}$$

and the inequalities given in (11a) hold for $p = a^{-1}$, unless

$$\mu^-_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) \succeq \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^+_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) \succ \beta. \tag{13}$$

If the inequalities given in (11a) are false for both $p = 1 - a^{-1}$ and $p = a^{-1}$, then the inequalities of both (12) and (13) hold. Let

$$p_1 := \sup\{p : \mu^-_{a,p}(p) \preceq \alpha \text{ and } \mu^+_{a,p}(p) \preceq \beta\} \quad \text{and} \quad p_2 := \inf\{p : \mu^-_{a,p}(p) \succeq \alpha \text{ and } \mu^+_{a,p}(p) \succeq \beta\}.$$

Lemma 3.6 implies that $p_2 \geq p_1$ and that if $p_2 > p > p_1$, then either the inequalities given in (11a) or the inequalities given in (11b) hold for p. If $p_1 = p_2$, then Lemma 3.6 implies that the inequalities given in (11b) hold at $p = p_1 = p_2$. □

Lemma 4.6. *Let $a \in (\exp(h(T)), 2)$ be fixed. Suppose that $T^-(q) \neq 1$ and $T^+(q) \neq 0$, then there exists a non-empty open interval $V \subseteq [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$, such that*

$$\alpha \prec \mu^-_{a,t}(t) \prec \mu^+_{a,t}(t) \prec \beta,$$

for all $t \in V$. Moreover, letting

$$p_1(a) := \max\left\{1 - a^{-1}, \sup\left\{p \in [1-a^{-1}, a^{-1}] : \mu^-_{a,p}(p) \preceq \alpha, \mu^+_{a,p}(p) \preceq \beta\right\}\right\} \tag{14a}$$

and

$$p_2(a) := \min\left\{a^{-1}, \inf\left\{p \in [1-a^{-1}, a^{-1}] : \mu^-_{a,p}(p) \succeq \alpha, \mu^+_{a,p}(p) \succeq \beta\right\}\right\}, \tag{14b}$$

we have that $V \subseteq (p_1(a), p_2(a))$ and hence $p_1(a) < p_2(a)$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.5, since $\ln(a) > h(T)$, there exists a $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ such that at least one of the following sets of inequalities hold

$$\alpha \prec \mu^-_{a,p}(p) \prec \mu^+_{a,p}(p) \preceq \beta, \tag{15a}$$

or

$$\alpha \preceq \mu^-_{a,p}(p) \prec \mu^+_{a,p}(p) \prec \beta. \tag{15b}$$

(Observe that the situation in which $\alpha = \mu^-_{a,p}(p)$ and $\mu^+_{a,p}(p) = \beta$ cannot occur since we have assumed that $\ln(a) > h(T)$.) Let such a p be fixed. If $p = 1 - a^{-1}$, then, by the definition of the itinerary map and the fact that $T^+(q) \neq 0$, we have that $\beta \succ 1\overline{0}$ and that $\mu^+_{a,p}(p) = 1\overline{0}$. Hence the inequalities given in (15b) hold. Similarly, if $p = a^{-1}$, then, by the definition of the itinerary map and the fact that $T^-(q) \neq 1$, we have that $\alpha \prec 0\overline{1}$ and that $\mu^-_{a,p}(p) = 0\overline{1}$, hence the inequalities given in (15a) hold.

Suppose that the inequalities given in (15a) hold for our fixed p. By the above remark, if $p = 1 - a^{-1}$, then the inequalities given in (15b) hold, and so we may assume that $p \neq 1 - a^{-1}$. Let $r := d(\mu^-_{a,p}(p), \alpha)$ and observe that $r > 0$. Recall, by Lemma 3.6, that the map $t \mapsto \mu^-_{a,t}(t)$ is left-continuous, and so,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} d(\mu^-_{a,p-\epsilon}(p - \epsilon), \mu^-_{a,p}(p)) = 0. \tag{16}$$

Therefore, there exists a real number $\delta \in (0, p - 1 + a^{-1})$, dependent on r, such that

$$d(\mu^-_{a,p-\epsilon}(p - \epsilon), \mu^-_{a,p}(p)) < r/2,$$

for all $\epsilon < \delta$. Since, by Lemma 3.6, the map $t \mapsto \mu^-_{a,t}(t)$ is strictly increasing, by definition of the metric d and by the definition of the lexicographic ordering in conjunction with the above inequality, it follows that $\alpha \prec \mu^-_{a,p-\epsilon}(p-\epsilon) \prec \mu^-_{a,p}(p)$, for all $\epsilon < \delta$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.6, the map $t \mapsto \mu^+_{a,t}(t)$ is strictly increasing, and so $\mu^+_{a,p-\epsilon}(p - \epsilon) \prec \mu^+_{a,p}(p)$, for all $\epsilon < \delta$. Therefore, by the definition of the itinerary maps $t \mapsto \mu^\pm_{a,t}(t)$ and by the hypothesis that the inequalities given in (15a) hold, we have that

$$\alpha \prec \mu^-_{a,p-\epsilon}(p - \epsilon) \prec \mu^+_{a,p-\epsilon}(p - \epsilon) \prec \mu^+_{a,p}(p) \prec \beta,$$

for all $\epsilon < \delta$. Further, since δ has been chosen to belong to the open interval $(0, p - 1 + a^{-1})$ and since p belongs to the half open interval $(1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$, it follows that

$$(p - \delta, p) \subset (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}).$$

Setting $V := (p - \delta, p)$ yields the required result.

A similar argument will yield the required result under the assumption that the inequalities given in (15b) hold for our fixed p.

The last statement, that $V \subseteq (p_1(a), p_2(a))$ is an immediate consequence of the definitions of $p_1(a)$ and $p_2(a)$ and Lemma 3.6. $\square$

Lemma 4.7. *For $a \in (1, 2)$ and $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$, the restriction of the coding map π_a to the set $\Omega^+_{a,p}$ and the restriction of π_a to the set $\Omega^-_{a,p}$ are strictly increasing. Furthermore, the restriction of the coding map π_a to the set $\Omega^+_{a,p} \cup \Omega^-_{a,p}$ is increasing.*

Proof. The first statement follows from Lemma 3.5 and Proposition 3.8.

To show that the restriction of the coding map π_a to the set $\Omega^+_{a,p} \cup \Omega^-_{a,p}$ is increasing, let ω and $\omega' \in \Omega^+_{a,p} \cup \Omega^-_{a,p}$ be such that $\omega \preceq \omega'$. One of the following situations must occur.

(i) $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega^+_{a,p}$ or $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega^-_{a,p}$.
(ii) $\big(\omega \in \Omega^-_{a,p} \setminus \Omega^+_{a,p}$ and $\omega' \in \Omega^+_{a,p} \setminus \Omega^-_{a,p}\big)$ or $\big(\omega \in \Omega^+_{a,p} \setminus \Omega^-_{a,p}$ and $\omega' \in \Omega^-_{a,p} \setminus \Omega^+_{a,p}\big)$.

In Case (i) the result follows since the restriction of π_a to the set $\Omega^+_{a,p}$ is strictly increasing and the restriction of π_a to the set $\Omega^-_{a,p}$ is strictly increasing.

Consider the first instance in Case (ii). Let $y := \pi_a(\omega)$ and $z := \pi_a(\omega')$. By way of contradiction, assume that $y > z$. By Lemma 3.5, we have, for all $z \in (0, 1)$, that

$$\mu^+_{a,p}(z) = \lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \mu^-_{a,p}(z + \epsilon). \tag{17}$$

Now

$$\omega' = \mu^+_{a,p}(z) = \lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \mu^-_{a,p}(z + \epsilon) \prec \mu^-_{a,p}(y) = \omega, \tag{18}$$

where the first equality holds since $\omega' \in \Omega^+_{a,p}$, and so there is an $x \in [0, 1]$ such that $\omega' = \mu^+_{a,p}(x)$. Then, by Proposition 3.8, we have $z := \pi_a(\omega') = \pi_a(\mu^+_{a,p}(x)) = x$. Hence $\omega' = \mu^+_{a,p}(x) = \mu^+_{a,p}(z)$. The second equality in (18) follows from (17); the following inequality is due to Lemma 3.5 and the fact that $y > z + \epsilon$ for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$; and the last equality follows in exactly the same way as the first equality. Therefore, $\omega' \prec \omega$, which contradicts our hypothesis, namely that $\omega \preceq \omega'$.

The second instance in Case (ii) is proved in exactly the same way as the first. $\square$

Lemma 4.8. *If $2 > a > \exp(h(T))$, $T^-(q) \neq 1$ and $T^+(q) \neq 0$, then $\pi_a(\alpha) < \pi_a(\beta)$ and*

$$\emptyset \neq (p_1(a), p_2(a)) \subseteq (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}),$$

where $p_1(a)$ and $p_2(a)$ are the real numbers defined in (14) respectively.

Proof. Suppose that $a \in (\exp(h(T)), 2)$. By Lemma 4.5, there exists a $p \in [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ such that either one of the following sets of inequalities hold,

(i) $\alpha \prec \mu^-_{a,p}(p)$ and $\mu^+_{a,p}(p) \preceq \beta$, or
(ii) $\alpha \preceq \mu^-_{a,p}(p)$ and $\mu^+_{a,p}(p) \prec \beta$.

Observe that by Lemma 4.5, the situation in which $\alpha = \mu^-_{a,p}(p)$ and $\mu^+_{a,p}(p) = \beta$ cannot occur since we have assumed that $a > \exp(h(T))$.

Assume that Case (i) occurs. By Theorem 4.3 it follows that

$$\Omega^-_q \subset \Omega^-_{a,p} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega^+_q \subseteq \Omega^+_{a,p}.$$

In particular $\alpha \in \Omega^-_{a,p}$ and $\beta \in \Omega^+_{a,p}$. Since, by Lemma 4.7, the coding map π_a is strictly increasing on the set $\Omega^+_{a,p}$ and on the set $\Omega^-_{a,p}$, we have

$$\pi_a(\alpha) < \pi_a(\mu^-_{a,p}(p)) = p = \pi_a(\mu^+_{a,p}(p)) \leq \pi_a(\beta). \tag{19}$$

If Case (ii) occurs, then essentially the same proof as above gives that

$$\pi_a(\alpha) \leq \pi_a(\mu^-_{a,p}(p)) = p = \pi_a(\mu^+_{a,p}(p)) < \pi_a(\beta). \tag{20}$$

Hence, $\pi_a(\alpha) < \pi_a(\beta)$ and the closed interval $[\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)] \cap [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ is non-empty.

To show that the open interval $(\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1})$ is non-empty it suffices to show that the closed interval $[\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)] \cap [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]$ is not a single point. To this end observe that, by Lemma 3.6 and the definition of $p_1(a)$ and $p_2(a)$, for all $t \in (p_1(a), p_2(a))$, there are two possible sets of inequalities that can occur:

$$\left(\alpha \succ \mu^-_{a,t}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta \prec \mu^+_{a,p}(t)\right) \quad \text{or} \quad \left(\alpha \prec \mu^-_{a,t}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta \succ \mu^+_{a,p}(t)\right).$$

The first set of inequalities, however, cannot occur since if they did, then by Theorem 4.3, the definition of topological entropy, and Theorem 2.3 we would have that $\ln(a) \leq h(T)$. Thus, by (19) and (20) we have that

$$(p_1(a), p_2(a)) \subseteq [\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)] \cap [1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}]. \tag{21}$$

Since our hypothesis is the same as that of Lemma 4.6, we have that $p_1(a) < p_2(a)$, and so, the open interval $(p_1(a), p_2(a))$ is non-empty. This, in tandem with (21), implies that the open interval $(\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1})$ is non-empty. $\square$

5. Proof of Theorems 1.6 and 1.8

With the prerequisites of Sections 3 and 4 we are now able to present the proofs of our main results, Theorems 1.6 and 1.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. In order to prove the result we will show the following set of implications (i) ⇒ (ii) ⇒ (iii) ⇒ (i).

((i) ⇒ (ii)) Let $a \in (\exp(h(T)), 2)$ be fixed. Lemma 4.8 states that $\pi_a(\alpha) < \pi_a(\beta)$ and that

$$\emptyset \neq (p_1(a), p_2(a)) \subseteq (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1}),$$

where $p_1(a)$ and $p_2(a)$ are the positive real numbers defined in (14). Observe that the conditions of Lemma 4.6 hold, since by our hypothesis we assume that $a \in (\exp(h(T), 2)$ and that $([0,1], T^{\pm})$ is a Lorenz system whose critical point q is such that $T^-(q) \neq 1$ and $T^+(q) \neq 0$. Therefore, there exists a p belonging to the non-empty open interval $(p_1(a), p_2(a)) \subseteq (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1})$ such that

$$\alpha \prec \mu^-_{a,p}(p) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^+_{a,p}(p) \prec \beta. \tag{22}$$

(We remind the reader that $\alpha := \tau^-_q(q)$ and $\beta := \tau^+_q(q)$ are the critical itineraries of the given Lorenz system $([0,1], T^{\pm})$.) Let such a p be fixed. By Theorem 4.3 and the inequalities given in (22) we have that

$$\Omega^-_q \subset \Omega^-_{a,p} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega^+_q \subset \Omega^+_{a,p}. \tag{23}$$

By Theorem 4.3, the inclusions given in (23) and the fact that the map $\pi_a|_{\Omega^+_{a,p} \cup \Omega^-_{a,p}}$ is increasing (Lemma 4.7) we have that $\pi_a(\omega) \in [0, \pi_a(\alpha)] \cup [\pi_a(\beta), 1]$, for all $\omega \in \Omega^+_q \cup \Omega^-_q$. In other words

$$\pi_a(\Omega^+_q \cup \Omega^-_q) \subseteq [0, \pi_a(\alpha)] \cup [\pi_a(\beta), 1]. \tag{24}$$

We claim that

$$U^{\pm}_{a,p}(x) = U^{\pm}_{a,p'}(x),$$

for each $x \in \pi_a(\Omega^+_q \cup \Omega^-_q)$ and for every $p' \in (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1})$, and that

$$U^{\pm}_{a,p'}(\pi_a(\Omega^+_q \cup \Omega^-_q)) \subseteq \pi_a(\Omega^+_q \cup \Omega^-_q),$$

where the definition of the maps $U^{\pm}_{a,p}$ are given in (1). It follows from this claim, for all $p' \in (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1})$, that

$$\mu^{\pm}_{a,p'}(x) = \mu^{\pm}_{a,p}(x) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in \pi_a(\Omega^+_q \cup \Omega^-_q). \tag{25}$$

To prove the claim, choose an arbitrary $p' \in (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1 - a^{-1}, a^{-1})$ and $x \in \pi_a(\Omega^+_q \cup \Omega^-_q)$. In light of the inclusion given in (24) there are two cases, either

$$x \in \pi_a(\Omega^+_q \cup \Omega^-_q) \cap [0, \pi_a(\alpha)] \quad \text{or} \quad x \in \pi_a(\Omega^+_q \cup \Omega^-_q) \cap [\pi_a(\beta), 1].$$

As the proofs are essentially the same, we take $x \in \pi_a(\Omega_q^+ \cup \Omega_q^-) \cap [0, \pi_a(\alpha)]$. Since both p and p' belong to the open interval $(\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1-a^{-1}, a^{-1})$, we have that $\pi_a(\alpha) < \min\{p, p'\}$. Moreover, $x \leq \pi_a(\alpha) < \min\{p, p'\}$; in particular $x \neq p$ and $x \neq p'$. From this and the definition of the functions $U_{a,p}^{\pm}$, it can be concluded that

$$U_{a,p}^{\pm}(x) = U_{a,p'}^{\pm}(x). \tag{26}$$

Since $x \in \pi_a(\Omega_q^+ \cup \Omega_q^-) \cap [0, \pi_a(\alpha)]$, there exists an $\omega \in \Omega_q^+ \cup \Omega_q^-$ such that $x = \pi_a(\omega)$, and so

$$U_{a,p'}^{\pm}(x) = U_{a,p}^{\pm}(x) = U_{a,p}^{\pm}(\pi_a(\omega)) = \pi_a(S(\omega)) \in \pi_a(\Omega_q^+ \cup \Omega_q^-),$$

where the first equality follows from (26); the second equality follows from the fact that $x = \pi_a(\omega)$; the final equality follows from the inclusions given in (23) and Proposition 3.8; and the inclusion $\pi_a(S(\omega)) \in \pi_a(\Omega_q^+ \cup \Omega_q^-)$ is due to that fact that $\Omega_q^+ \cup \Omega_q^-$ is forward shift sub-invariant (Lemma 4.2). Thus the claim is proved.

By the inclusion given in (23) we have that $\alpha \in \Omega_{a,p}^-$ and $\beta \in \Omega_{a,p}^+$. So there exist $x, y \in [0,1]$ such that $\alpha = \mu_{a,p}^-(x)$ and $\beta = \mu_{a,p}^+(y)$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.8 we have that

$$\mu_{a,p}^-(\pi_a(\alpha)) = \mu_{a,p}^-(\pi_a(\mu_{a,p}^-(x)) = \mu_{a,p}^-(x) = \alpha \quad \textit{and} \quad \mu_{a,p}^+(\pi_a(\beta)) = \mu_{a,p}^+(\pi_a(\mu_{a,p}^+(y)) = \mu_{a,p}^+(y) = \beta.$$

This, in combination with (25), implies that $\mu_{a,p'}^-(\pi_a(\alpha)) = \alpha$ and $\mu_{a,p'}^+(\pi_a(\beta)) = \beta$, for all $p' \in (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1-a^{-1}, a^{-1})$. Hence, $\alpha \in \Omega_{a,p'}^-$ and $\beta \in \Omega_{a,p'}^+$. It follows from Theorem 4.3 that

$$\alpha \in [\overline{0}, \mu_{a,p'}^-(p')] \cup (\mu_{a,p'}^+(p'), \overline{1}].$$

(We remind the reader that $\overline{0}$ denotes the element $0\,0\,0 \cdots \in \Omega$ and $\overline{1}$ to denotes the element $1\,1\,1 \cdots \in \Omega$.) Since α begins with 01, it must be the case that $\alpha \in [\overline{0}, \mu_{a,p'}^-(p')]$. Moreover, $\alpha \neq \mu_{a,p'}^-(p')$, since if $\alpha = \mu_{a,p'}^-(p')$, then by Proposition 3.8 we would have that $\pi_a(\alpha) = \pi_a(\mu_{a,p'}^-(p')) = p'$, which contradicts that $p' \in (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1-a^{-1}, a^{-1})$. A similar argument shows that $\beta \in (\mu_{a,p'}^+(p'), \overline{1}]$. Therefore,

$$\alpha \prec \mu_{a,p'}^-(p') \quad \text{and} \quad \beta \succ \mu_{a,p'}^+(p')$$

for all $p' \in (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1-a^{-1}, a^{-1})$.

((ii) ⇒ (iii)) This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.3.

((iii) ⇒ (i)) If $\Omega_q^- \subset \Omega_{a,p}^-$ and $\Omega_q^+ \subset \Omega_{a,p}^+$ for $p \in (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1-a^{-1}, a^{-1})$, then by Theorem 4.3 we have that

$$\alpha \preceq \mu_{a,p}^-(p) \prec \mu_{a,p}^+(p) \prec \beta \quad \text{or} \quad \alpha \prec \mu_{a,p}^-(p) \prec \mu_{a,p}^+(p) \preceq \beta,$$

and so by Corollary 4.4 we have that $\exp(h(T)) \leq a$. We will now show that $\exp(h(T)) \neq a$ if $\Omega_q^{\pm} \subset \Omega_{a,p}^{\pm}$. In order to reach a contradiction, suppose that $\exp(h(T)) = a$ and that

$$\Omega_q^+ \subset \Omega_{a,p}^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_q^- \subset \Omega_{a,p}^-,$$

for some $p \in (\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta)) \cap (1-a^{-1}, a^{-1})$. Therefore, fix a p, such that either

$$\alpha \preceq \mu_{a,p}^-(p) \prec \mu_{a,p}^+(p) \prec \beta \quad \text{or} \quad \alpha \prec \mu_{a,p}^-(p) \prec \mu_{a,p}^+(p) \preceq \beta \tag{28}$$

holds. By [24, Theorem 5], or alternatively by [4, Theorem 6.5], we know that there exists a unique $s \in (1,2)$ and a unique $p' \in [1-s^{-1}, s^{-1}]$ such that the uniform Lorenz system $([0,1], U_{s,p'}^{\pm})$ is topologically conjugate to the given Lorenz system $([0,1], T^{\pm})$. Moreover, since the topological conjugacy preserves topological entropy (Lemma 2.5) and since by Theorem 2.3 we have that $h(U_{s,p'}^{\pm}) = \ln(s)$, it follows that $s = \exp(h(T)) = a$. Hence, by Lemma 2.5, we have that $\Omega_q^{\pm} = \Omega_{s,p'}^{\pm} = \Omega_{a,p'}^{\pm}$ and therefore,

$$\alpha = \mu_{a,p'}^-(p') \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{a,p'}^+(p') = \beta. \tag{29}$$

Combining (29) with (28) and then applying Lemma 3.6 gives a desired contradiction. □

Before presenting the proof of Theorem 1.8 we given the following example which illustrates the importance of taking the intersection of the open interval $(\pi_a(\alpha), \pi_a(\beta))$ with the open interval $(1-a^{-1}, a^{-1})$ in statements (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 1.6. Namely it demonstrates that the inequality $\pi_a(\alpha) < 1 - a^{-1}$ or the inequality $\pi_a(\beta) > a^{-1}$ may occur and therefore the corresponding uniform Lorenz system, given in statements (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 1.6 may not be well defined.

Example 5.1. *An instance of when the inequality $\pi_a(\beta) > a^{-1}$ can occur is when $T^{\pm}$ is a Lorenz map where the first branch is a linear function with gradient close to* 1 *and the second branch is a function of high polynomial or exponential growth. An explicit example of such a map is the Lorenz map with critical point* 1/2 *given by the functions*

$$f_0(x) := 1.001x \quad \textit{and} \quad f_1(x) := \exp(x + \ln(2) - 1) - 1.$$

In this case the inequality $\pi_a(\alpha) < 1 - a^{-1}$ is satisfied for $a = 3/2 > \exp(h(T)) \approx 1.00125$. (This latter value was calculated using an implemented version of the algorithm, with a tolerance $\epsilon = 0.0001$ and a truncation tern $n = 25,000$, see Page 13.) By reversing the roles of the first and second branch one obtains a Lorenz map with $\pi_a(\beta) > a^{-1}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. As the proofs for (i) and (ii) are essentially the same, we only include a proof of (i). The result is proved by showing the following set of implications (a) ⇒ (b) ⇒ (c) ⇒ (a).

(a) ⇒ (b) Let $a \in (\exp(h(T)), 2)$ and suppose that the inequalities given in (4) do not hold for $p = a^{-1}$. Then by definition we have that $\tau_q^-(q) = \mu_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) = 0\overline{1}$. An application of Corollary 4.4 then leads to a contradiction to how the parameter a was originally chosen. The uniqueness follows directly from Lemma 3.6.

(b) ⇒ (c) This is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.3 and the fact that $a > \exp(h(T))$.

(c) ⇒ (a) The proof is essentially the same as the proof of (iii) ⇒ (i) of Theorem 1.6. □

6. AN ALGORITHM TO COMPUTE THE TOPOLOGICAL ENTROPY OF A LORENZ MAP

The numerical computation of topological entropy of one dimensional dynamical systems has recently received much attention, see, for instance [7, 8, 13, 21] and references therein. In this section we provide a new algorithm to compute the topological entropy of a Lorenz system. As mentioned in the introduction, our algorithm significantly differs from the known algorithms in that it does not require techniques of finding the maximal zero of a power series nor does it require the calculation of the zero of a pressure functional. The foundations of the algorithm are Theorems 1.6 and 1.8 and the algorithm is stated assuming infinite precision arithmetic. However, with straightforward modifications, the algorithm can be practically implemented. Such an implementation was used in obtaining the examples at the end of this section. We now present the algorithm after which we give a proof of its validity.

```
Input:  A Lorenz system $([0,1], T^{\pm})$ with critical point $q$ and a tolerance $\epsilon \in (0,1)$.
Output: An estimate to $h(T^+) = h(T^-)$ within a tolerance $\epsilon$.
  (1) Compute: $\alpha := \tau_q^+(q)$ and $\beta := \tau_q^-(q)$.
  (2) Initialise: $a_1 = 1$ and $a_2 = 2$.
  (3) Set $a = \frac{a_1+a_2}{2}$.
  (4) If both $\alpha \neq 0\overline{1}$ and $\beta \neq 1\overline{0}$ , then go to Step (5), else go to Step (4)(a).
      (a) If both $\alpha = 0\overline{1}$ and $\beta \neq 1\overline{0}$, then compute $\mu^+_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1})$ and go to Step(11), else go to Step(4)(b).
      (b) Compute $\mu^-_{a,1-a^{-1}}(1-a^{-1})$ and go to Step (12).
  (5) Compute: $\pi_a(\alpha)$ and $\pi_a(\beta)$.
  (6) Compute: $t_1(a) := \max\{\pi_a(\alpha), 1-a^{-1}\}$ and $t_2(a) := \min\{\pi_a(\beta), a^{-1}\}$.
  (7) If $t_1(a) \geq t_2(a)$, then $a_1 \leftarrow a$ and go to Step(13), else go to Step(8).
  (8) Set $p$ equal to the real number $(t_1(a) + t_2(a))/2$.
  (9) Compute: $\mu^+_{a,p}(p)$ and $\mu^-_{a,p}(p)$.
 (10) If $\alpha \prec \mu^-_{a,p}(p)$ and $\mu^+_{a,p}(p) \prec \beta$, then go to Step (10)(a), else go to Step (10)(b).
      (a) $a_2 \leftarrow a$ and go to Step(13).
      (b) $a_1 \leftarrow a$ and go to Step(13).
 (11) If $\mu^+_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) \prec \beta$, then $a_2 \leftarrow a$ and go to Step (13), else $a_1 \leftarrow a$ and go to Step (13).
 (12) If $\alpha \prec \mu^-_{a,1-a^{-1}}(1-a^{-1})$, then $a_2 \leftarrow a$ and go to Step(13), else $a_1 \leftarrow a$ and go to Step (13).
 (13) If $a_2 - a_1 < \epsilon/2$, then return
          $h(T^+) = h(T^-) \in [\ln((a_1+a_2)/2 - \epsilon/4), \ln((a_1+a_2)/2 + \epsilon/4)]$
      and terminate the algorithm, else go to Step(3).
```

Proof of the validity of the Algorithm. The variable a in the algorithm is the midpoint of the interval $[a_1, a_2]$ which is initialized at $[a_1, a_2] = [1, 2]$. It is clear that

$$\ln(a_1) = \ln(1) = 0 \leq h(T) < \ln(2) = \ln(a_2).$$

We will show that, throughout the algorithm, the inequality

$$\ln(a_1) \leq h(T) \leq \ln(a_2) \tag{30}$$

is maintained. (Here we remind the reader that the common value $h(T^+) = h(T^-)$ is denoted by $h(T)$.) A tolerance $\epsilon > 0$ is fixed at the start. At each iteration (Step (3) to Step (13)) of the algorithm, the length of this interval $[a_1, a_2]$ is halved until, at Step (13), we arrive at $a_2 - a_1 < \epsilon/2$. According to the above inequality, at this point we have estimated the entropy within the desired tolerance $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, specifically

$$\ln\left((a_1 + a_2)/2 - \epsilon/4\right) \leq h(T) \leq \ln\left((a_1 + a_2)/2 + \epsilon/4\right).$$

Suppose, in Step (4), that $\alpha \neq 0\overline{1}$ and $\beta \neq 1\overline{0}$, namely that the critical point q is such that $f_0(q) \neq 1$ and $f_1(q) \neq 0$. (Here, we remind the reader that $f_0 : [0, q] \to [0, 1]$ and $f_1 : [q, 1] \to [0, 1]$ are the expanding maps which define the given Lorenz systems $([0, 1], T^{\pm})$ see Definition 1.1.) At Step (7) or Step (10) the interval $[a_1, a_2]$ will be replaced by either $[a_1, a]$ or $[a, a_2]$, where a has the value $(a_1 + a_2)/2$. It will now be proved that at each iteration (Step (3) to Step (13)), the inequalities given in (30) are maintained. To see this we will follow the steps of the algorithm. At Step (3), the value of a is set to the value of the midpoint of the interval $[a_1, a_2]$. In Step (5), the images of the critical itineraries α and β of the given Lorenz system $([0, 1], T^{\pm})$ under the coding map π_a are computed. In Step (6), the values of $t_1(a)$ and $t_2(a)$ are set to the left and right endpoints, respectively, of an interval which, according to Lemma 4.8, has non-empty interior provided that $h(T) < \ln(a)$. Therefore, if $t_1(a) \geq t_2(a)$, then $h(T) \geq \ln(a)$. In this case, the value of a_1 is reset to the value of a in Step (7) and the inequalities given in (30) are maintained. The algorithm then proceeds to Step (13).

On the other hand, if $t_2(a) > t_1(a)$, then in Step (8) the value of p is set to the midpoint of the interval $[t_1(a), t_2(a)]$. In Step (9) the algorithm computes the critical itineraries, $\mu^+_{a,p}(p)$ and $\mu^-_{a,p}(p)$, of the uniform Lorenz systems $([0, 1], U^{\pm}_{a,p})$. In Step (10) the algorithm compares $\mu^-_{a,p}(p)$ with α and compares $\mu^+_{a,p}(p)$ with β. There are two possibilities, either both

$$\mu^-_{a,p}(p) \succ \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^+_{a,p}(p) \prec \beta$$

hold or not.

(i) If $\mu^-_{a,p}(p) \succ \alpha$ and $\mu^+_{a,p}(p) \prec \beta$, then $h(T) \leq \ln(a)$, see Corollary 4.4. Therefore, to maintain the inequalities given in (30), the value of a_2 is reset to the value of a.

(ii) Otherwise, we have $h(T) \geq \ln(a)$. Since, if this was not the case, then this would contradict Theorem 1.6. Therefore, to maintain the inequalities given in (30), the value of a_1 is reset to the value of a.

In either of the above two case, the algorithm then proceeds to Step (13).

Returning to Step (4), suppose that $\alpha = 0\overline{1}$ and $\beta \neq 1\overline{0}$. Observe that for all $a \in (1, 2)$ we have that $\mu^-_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) = \alpha = 0\overline{1}$. For each $a \in (1, 2)$ there are two possibilities, either $\mu^+_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) \prec \beta$ or not.

(iii) If $\mu^+_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) \prec \beta$, then, by Corollary 4.4 and since $\mu^-_{a,p}(p) = \alpha = 0\overline{1}$, we have that $h(T) \leq \ln(a)$. Therefore, to maintain the inequalities given in (30), the value of a_2 is reset to the value of a. The algorithm then proceeds to Step (13).

(iv) If $\mu^+_{a,a^{-1}}(a^{-1}) \succeq \beta$, then, by Corollary 4.4 and since $\mu^-_{a,p}(p) = \alpha = 0\overline{1}$, we have that $h(T) \geq \ln(a)$. Therefore, to maintain the inequalities given in (30), the value of a_1 is reset to the value of a. The algorithm then proceeds to Step (13).

At Step (13), provided that $a_2 - a_1 \geq \epsilon/2$, the algorithm proceeds to the next iteration, otherwise the algorithm returns

$$h(T^+) = h(T^-) \in [\ln((a_1 + a_2)/2 - \epsilon/4), \ln((a_1 + a_2)/2 + \epsilon/4)]$$

and terminates.

Similarly, if $\alpha \neq 0\overline{1}$ and $\beta = 1\overline{0}$, then in Step (4)(b) of the algorithm the value of p is set to $1 - a^{-1}$ and the itinerary $\mu^-_{a,1-a^{-1}}(1 - a^{-1})$ is computed. The algorithm then proceeds to Step (12), where, to maintain the inequalities given in (30), the algorithm either

(v) resets the value of a_2 to the value of a, if $\alpha \prec \mu^{-}_{a,1-a^{-1}}(1-a^{-1})$, or

(vi) resets the value of a_1 to the value of a, if $\alpha \succeq \mu^{-}_{a,1-a^{-1}}(1-a^{-1})$.

The algorithm then goes to Step (13), where it either proceeds to the next iteration or terminates.

Observe that the situation where $\alpha = 0\overline{1}$ and $\beta = 1\overline{0}$ cannot occur, since by definition of the itineraries, this would immediately imply that $f_0(q) = 1$ and $f_1(q) = 0$. Thus, the given system is not a Lorenz system as it would violate condition (i) of Definition 1.1. $\square$

Sample results. Finally we present two examples which demonstrate an implemented version of our algorithm. These examples indicate that our algorithm returns an accurate estimate for the entropy of a Lorenz system. As mentioned above, to practically implement the algorithm we need to make straightforward modifications. In particular, itineraries are calculated to a prescribed length $n \geq 3$, which is an additional input, called the *truncation term*, in the implemented algorithm.

Example 6.1. *Consider the Lorenz map $T^{\pm}$ with critical point q given by the functions*

$$f_0(x) = a\sqrt{x} \quad \text{and} \quad f_1(x) = bx + 1 - b,$$

where $a = 1.25$, $b = (a^{-6} - 1)/(a^{-2} - 1)$ and $q = 1/a^2$. The reason for this choice of a, b, q is that, in this case, there is a theoretical method for determining the topological entropy of the map $T^{\pm}$. This in turn allows us to compare the estimated value for the entropy given by our algorithm to the actual value. To be more precise, to theoretically determine the topological entropy we use the fact that for this choice of a, b, q the critical itineraries are periodic and therefore, this Lorenz map is Markov. Further, for Markov maps the topological entropy is the logarithm of the maximum eigenvalue of the associated adjacency matrix [10, Proposition 3.4.1]*. Using this method we obtain that $h(T^{\pm}) = \ln((1+\sqrt{5})/2) \approx 0.4812118251$. The following table gives the output of a practically implemented version of our algorithm for this map, where ϵ denote the tolerance term and n denotes the truncation term. In particular, this table shows that our algorithm provides a very good estimate of the topological entropy.*

	$\epsilon = 10^{-2}$	$\epsilon = 10^{-4}$	$\epsilon = 10^{-6}$
$n = 10$	*0.4831010758*	*0.4811979105*	*0.4812117615*
$n = 100$	*0.4831010758*	*0.4811979105*	*0.4812117615*
$n = 1,000$	*0.4831010758*	*0.4811979105*	*0.4812117615*
$n = 10,000$	*0.4831010758*	*0.4811979105*	*0.4812117615*

Example 6.2. *Here we consider the uniform Lorenz map $U^{\pm}_{a,1/2}$ and the uniform Lorenz map $U^{\pm}_{a,a^{-1}}$ for $a = \sqrt{2}$, which, by Lemma 2.5, both have topological entropy equal to $\log(\sqrt{2}) \approx 0.34657359023$. The following table gives the output of a practically implemented version of our algorithm for these maps, where ϵ denote the tolerance and n denotes the truncation term. As in the in previous example, for these maps, this table shows that our algorithm provides a very good estimate of the topological entropy.*

	$p = 1/2$		$p = a^{-1} = 1/\sqrt{2}$	
	$\epsilon = 10^{-3}$	$\epsilon = 10^{-6}$	$\epsilon = 10^{-3}$	$\epsilon = 10^{-6}$
$n = 10$	*0.3652803888*	*0.3655560121*	*0.3475021428*	*0.3471925188*
$n = 100$	*0.3468120116*	*0.3465736575*	*0.3468120116*	*0.3465736575*
$n = 1,000$	*0.3468120116*	*0.3465736575*	*0.3468120116*	*0.3465736575*
$n = 10,000$	*0.3468120116*	*0.3465736575*	*0.3468120116*	*0.3465736575*

Acknowledgements

Our thanks go to Michael Barnsley for hosting us at the Australian National University and for providing the initial motivation for this paper. We would also like to acknowledge Jed Keesling for his initial indispensable suggestions.

REFERENCES

[1] BibliographyR. L. Adler, A. G. Konheim and M. M. McAndrew. Topological entropy. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **114** (1965) 309–319.

[2] BibliographyL. Alsedà and F. Mañosas. Kneading theory for a family of circle maps with one discontinuity. *Acta Math. Univ. Comenian. (N.S.) 65* (1996) 11–22.

[3] BibliographyM. F. Barnsley, B. Harding and K. Igudesman. How to transform and filter images using iterated function systems. *Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics* **4** (2011) 1001–1028.

[4] BibliographyM. F. Barnsley, B. Harding and A. Vince. The entropy of an overlapping dynamical system. *Preprint* (2011).

[5] BibliographyM. F. Barnsley and N. Mihalache. Symmetric itinerary sets. *Preprint* (2011).

[6] BibliographyM. F. Barnsley and A. Vince. A Combinatorial Characterization of the Critical Itineraries of an Overlapping Dynamical System. *Preprint.* (2012).

[7] BibliographyL. Block and J. Keesling. Computing the Topological Entropy of Maps of the Interval with Three Monotone Pieces. *J. Stat. Phys.* **66** (1992) 755–774.

[8] BibliographyL. Block, J. Keesling, S. Li and K. Peterson. An Improved Algorithm for Computing Topological Entropy. *J. Stat. Phys.* **55** (1989) 929–939.

[9] BibliographyR. E. Bowen. *Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms.* Lecture Notes in Maths. vol. 470, (Springer-Verlag, 1975).

[10] BibliographyM. Brin and G. Stuck *Introduction to dynamical systems.* Cambridge University Press (2002).

[11] BibliographyK. Dajani and C. Kraaikamp. *Ergodic theory of numbers.* The Carus Mathematical Monographs, Number 29 (2002).

[12] BibliographyB. Eckhardt and G. Ott. Periodic orbit analysis of the Lorenz attractor. *Zeit. Phys. B* **93** (1994) 258266.

[13] BibliographyG. Froyland, R. Murray and D. Terhesiu. Efficient computation of topological entropy, pressure, conformal measures, and equilibrium states in one dimension. *Phys. Rev. E* **76** (2007).

[14] BibliographyP. Glendinning. Topological conjugation of Lorenz maps by β-transformations. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **107** (1990) 401–413.

[15] BibliographyP. Glendinning and T. Hall. Zeros of the kneading invariant and topological entropy for Lorenz maps. *Nonlinearity.* **9** (1996). 999–1014.

[16] BibliographyP. Glendinning and C. Sparrow. Prime and renormalisable kneading invariants and the dynamics of expanding Lorenz maps. *Phys. D.* **62** (1993) 22–50.

[17] BibliographyF. Hofbauer. *Maximal measures for piecewise monotonically increasing transformations on* $[0,1]$. Lecture Notes in Maths. vol. 729 (Springer-Verlag, 1979) 66–77.

[18] BibliographyF. Hofbauer and P. Raith. The Hausdorff dimension of an ergodic invariant measure for a piecewise monotonic map of the interval. *Canad. Math. Bull.* **35** (1992) 84-98.

[19] BibliographyJ. H. Hubbard and C. Sparrow. The classification of topologically expansive Lorenz maps. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **43** (1990), 431–443.

[20] BibliographyE. N. Lorenz. Deterministic Nonperiodic Flow. *J. Atmos. Sci.* **20** (1963) 130-141.

[21] BibliographyJ. Miilnor, Is Entropy Effectively Computable. *www. math. iupui. edu/ ~mmisiure/ open* (2002).

[22] BibliographyJ. Milnor and W. Thurston. *On iterated maps of the interval.* Lecture Notes in Maths. vol. 67 (Springer-Verlag, 1980) 45–63.

[23] BibliographyM. Misiurewicz. Possible jumps of entropy for interval maps. *Qual. Th. Dyn. Syst.* **2** (2001) 289–306.

[24] BibliographyW. Parry. Symbolic dynamics and transformations of the unit interval. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **122** (1965) 368–378.

[25] BibliographyD. Viswanath. Symbolic dynamics and periodic orbits of the Lorenz attractor. *Nonlinearity* **16** (2003) 1035–1056.

[26] BibliographyR. F. Williams. Structure of Lorenz attractors. *Publ. Math. IHES* **50** (1980) 73–100.

FACHBEREICH 3 - MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT BREMEN, BIBLIOTHEKSTRASSE 1, 28359 BREMEN, GERMANY.
E-mail address: `tony@math.uni-bremen.de`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN, BELFIELD, DUBLIN 4, IRELAND.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINEVILLE, FLORIDA, USA.
E-mail address: `avince@ufl.edu`